

PHILLIP A. TALBERT  
United States Attorney  
KIMBERLY A. SANCHEZ  
Assistant United States Attorney  
2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401  
Fresno, CA 93721  
Telephone: (559) 497-4000  
Facsimile: (559) 497-4099

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
United States of America

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
ANDREW SATARIANO,  
  
Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:21-CR-00295-JLT SKO

STIPULATION CONTINUING STATUS  
CONFERENCE AND REGARDING  
EXCLUDABLE TIME PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY  
TRIAL ACT; FINDINGS AND ORDER

DATE: December 7, 2022

TIME: 1:00 p.m.

COURT: Hon. Sheila K. Oberto

This case is set for a status conference on December 7, 2022 in front of the Honorable Sheila K. Oberto, U.S. Magistrate Court Judge. The parties stipulate and request to continue the status conference to February 15, 2023 at 1:00 p.m. Counsel needs additional time to review discovery, conduct additional investigation, and engage in additional discussions with the government and work towards a potential plea agreement.

On May 26, 2021, the Court issued General Order 631, which provided for a reopening of the courthouse in June 2021, recognized the continued public health emergency, continued to authorize video or teleconference court appearances in various cases, and noted the court's continued ability under the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act (the "Act") to continue trials and other matters, excluding time under the Act. On June 27, 2022, the Court issued General Order 652, which "authorized the use of videoconference and teleconference technology in certain criminal proceedings under the in the Eastern District of California." This and previous General Orders highlight

1 and were entered to address public health concerns related to COVID-19. Pursuant to F.R.Cr.P. 5.1(c)  
 2 and (d), a preliminary hearing must be held “no later than 14 days after initial appearance if the  
 3 defendant is in custody,” unless the defendant consents and there is a “showing of good cause”, or if the  
 4 defendant does not consent and there is a “showing that extraordinary circumstances exist and justice  
 5 requires the delay.” Here, the defendant consents and there is good cause.

6 Although the General Orders address the district-wide health concern, the Supreme Court has  
 7 emphasized that the Speedy Trial Act’s end-of-justice provision “counteract[s] substantive  
 8 openendedness with procedural strictness,” “demand[ing] on-the-record findings” in a particular case.  
 9 *Zedner v. United States*, 547 U.S. 489, 509 (2006). “[W]ithout on-the-record findings, there can be no  
 10 exclusion under” § 3161(h)(7)(A). *Id.* at 507. Moreover, any such failure cannot be harmless. *Id.* at  
 11 509; *see also United States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a  
 12 judge ordering an ends-of-justice continuance must set forth explicit findings on the record “either orally  
 13 or in writing”).

14 Based on the plain text of the Speedy Trial Act—which *Zedner* emphasizes as both mandatory  
 15 and inexcusable—General Orders 611, 612, 617, 631 and 652 require specific supplementation. Ends-  
 16 of-justice continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the basis of his  
 17 findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and  
 18 the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is excludable  
 19 unless “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or finding that  
 20 the ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public  
 21 and the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

22 The General Orders exclude delay in the “ends of justice.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code  
 23 T4). Although the Speedy Trial Act does not directly address continuances stemming from pandemics,  
 24 natural disasters, or other emergencies, this Court has discretion to order a continuance in such  
 25 circumstances. For example, the Ninth Circuit affirmed a two-week ends-of-justice continuance  
 26 following Mt. St. Helens’ eruption. *Furlow v. United States*, 644 F.2d 764 (9th Cir. 1981). The court  
 27 recognized that the eruption made it impossible for the trial to proceed. *Id.* at 767-68; *see also United*  
 28 *States v. Correa*, 182 F. Supp. 326, 329 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (citing *Furlow* to exclude time following the

September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and the resultant public emergency). The coronavirus is posing a similar, albeit more enduring, barrier to the prompt proceedings mandated by the statutory rules.

In light of the societal context created by the foregoing, this Court should consider the following case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-justice exception, § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4).<sup>1</sup> If continued, this Court should designate a new date for the status conference. *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any pretrial continuance must be “specifically limited in time”).

### STIPULATION

Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendants, by and through defendants’ counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

1. Defense counsel needs additional time to review discovery, conduct additional investigation, and engage in additional discussions with the government and work towards a potential plea agreement. Since the last continuance, the parties have engaged in further plea negotiations and discussions regarding resolution, and the government revised a prior plea agreement sent to defendant. Defense needs additional time to review the revised plea agreement and conduct any additional investigation warranted as a result of that.

2. By this stipulation, defendants now move to continue the December 7, 2022 status conference to February 15, 2023 and to exclude time from December 7, 2022 to February 15, 2023 under Local Code T4.

3. The parties agree and stipulate, and request that the Court find the following:

a) The government has represented that the discovery associated with this case includes investigative reports, videos, photos, and related documents in electronic form. All of this discovery has been either produced directly to counsel and/or made available for inspection and copying.

b) The parties have engaged in further plea negotiations and discussions regarding resolution, and the government revised a prior plea agreement sent to defendant. Defense needs

---

<sup>1</sup> The parties note that General Order 612 acknowledges that a district judge may make “additional findings to support the exclusion” at the judge’s discretion. General Order 612, ¶ 5 (E.D. Cal. March 18, 2020).

1 additional time to review the revised plea agreement and conduct any additional investigation  
2 warranted as a result of that.

3 c) The government does not object to the continuance.

4 d) In addition to the public health concerns cited by the General Orders and  
5 declarations of judicial emergency, and presented by the evolving COVID-19 pandemic, an  
6 ends-of-justice delay is particularly apt in this case because:

- 7 • Defendants ability to prepare for trial or a plea has been inhibited by the public  
8 health emergency;
- 9 • Defendants needs additional time to review discovery, conduct additional  
10 investigation, and work towards a potential plea agreement; and  
11

12 e) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the  
13 case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the  
14 original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

15 f) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161,  
16 et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period of December 7, 2022 to February 15,  
17 2023, inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code  
18 T4] because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at defendant's request on the basis  
19 of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best  
20 interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

21 **[Remainder of page intentionally left blank.]**  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial must commence.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: November 14, 2022

PHILLIP A. TALBERT  
United States Attorney

/s/ KIMBERLY A. SANCHEZ  
KIMBERLY A. SANCHEZ  
Assistant United States Attorney

Dated: November 14, 2022

/s/ Steven L. Crawford  
Attorney for Defendant  
ANDREW SATARIANO

**ORDER**

IT IS SO ORDERED that the status conference is continued from December 7, 2022, to **February 15, 2023, at 1:00 p.m. before Magistrate Judge Sheila K. Oberto.** Time is excluded pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **November 15, 2022**

/s/ *Barbara A. McAuliffe*  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE